arXiv:hep-ph/9609494v2 30 Sep 1996

A Possible Explanation of the Excess Jet Production at Large E_T

Elliot Leader
Department of Physics
Birkbeck College, University of London
Malet Street, London WC1E 7HX, England
E-mail: e.leader@physics.bbk.ac.uk

Dimiter B. Stamenov
Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Blvd. Tsarigradsko chaussee 72, Sofia 1784, Bulgaria
E-mail:stamenov@inrne.acad.bg

Abstract

We demonstrate that the significant discrepancy between conventional QCD and the CDF inclusive jet production data could be an indication that the behaviour of the Callan-Symanzik β function in QCD corresponds to it having a *finite fixed point*.

The inclusive jet production cross section in $p\bar{p} \rightarrow jet + X$ at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8\ TeV$, reported recently by the CDF Collaboration [1], is significantly higher than the $O(\alpha_s^3)$ QCD predictions of Ellis, Kunszt and Soper [2] for events with very high transverse energy ($200 \leq E_T \leq 440 GeV$), no matter which of a large set of standard parton densities is utilised in the calculations. This has led to radical claims, for instance, that we are seeing evidence for the existence of constituents of quarks [1, 3].

In this note we wish to suggest an unconventional, but much less radical, solution to the problem. We remind the reader that the Callan-Symanzik β function, $\beta(\alpha)$, which controls the μ^2 - evolution of the running coupling $\alpha_s(\mu^2)$, in Perturbative QCD is only calculable for small α. From these calculations it follows [4] that PQCD is asymptotically free which means that $\alpha_s(\mu^2)$ tends to zero as $\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty$. But this is true only if the β function is *assumed* to be negative for all α up to $O(1)$ (solid curve in Fig. 1).

Some time ago one of us [5] investigated to what extent the data on deep inelastic scattering [6] for $Q^2 \leq 500\ GeV^2$ and LEP data [7] constrained the possibility of a so-called *fixed point* behaviour for QCD, in which $\beta(\alpha)$ could have one of the forms shown by the dotted and dashed curves in Fig. 1, corresponding to a first or second order ultraviolet fixed point α_0, respectively. In the *fixed point* scenarios QCD is *not* asymptotically free (e.g. see the review [8] and for the recent development of the topic Ref. [9]) and $\alpha_s(\mu^2) \rightarrow \alpha_0 > 0$ as $\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty$. It was found that the data mentioned above are perfectly consistent with values of $\alpha_0 = 0.057$ for a first order zero of $\beta(\alpha)$ and $0.029 \leq \alpha_0 \leq 0.048$ for the second order case. The essential point relevant to the jet production cross section is the fact that $\alpha_s^{FP}(\mu^2)$ runs more slowly than $\alpha_s(\mu^2)$ does in QCD for large μ^2, as shown in Fig. 2, and will thus lead to cross sections which are enhanced relative to the conventional QCD predictions as E_T increases.

Let us now consider how we can estimate the difference between the theoretical cross sections in the *fixed point* and conventional versions of QCD. For fixed $\sqrt{s} = 1.8\ TeV$ and averaged over pseudorapidity η the theoretical cross section depend upon E_T, the running coupling $\alpha_s(\mu^2)$ at scale μ and the parton distributions $f_i(x, \mu^2)$ at the same scale μ. It is believed that μ should be of order E_T and the graphical comparison between the data and conventional QCD shown in [1] utilises $\mu = E_T/2$.

Now suppose that we have a conventional QCD calculation σ_n of the order $(\alpha_s)^n$ contribution to the cross section. The fixed point analogue σ_n^{FP} will differ both on account of the different value of the running coupling and because the evolution of the parton densities is slightly different. Based upon the studies in Ref. [5], we believe the latter to be very small effect.

Hence in Born (leading order) approximation we expect to have

$$\frac{d\sigma^{FP}_{Born}}{dE_T}(E_T, \mu, \alpha_s^{FP}(\mu^2)) \cong \left[\frac{\alpha_s^{FP}(\mu^2)}{\alpha_s(\mu^2)}\right]^2 \frac{d\sigma_{Born}}{dE_T}(E_T, \mu, \alpha_s(\mu^2)) \ . \tag{1}$$

On other hand, as shown in [2], the Born cross section in conventional QCD is essentially equal to the full (leading plus next-to-leading) one at $\mu = E_T$:

$$\frac{d\sigma_{Born}}{dE_T}(E_T, \alpha_s(E_T^2)) = \frac{d\sigma_{Full}}{dE_T}(E_T, \alpha_s(E_T^2)) \ . \tag{2}$$

This result is obtained in [2] for $\eta = 0$ and cone size $R = 0.6$ at $E_T = 100\ GeV$. For the kinematic range of interest ($R = 0.7$ and η averaged in the interval $0.1 \leq |\eta| \leq 0.7$) the value of μ at which Eq. (2) holds will be somewhat below $\mu/E_T = 1$ and its precise value will depend weakly on E_T , but is essentially independent of E_T in the range $200 \leq E_T \leq 440\ GeV$ [10].

Hence, using Eqs. (1) and (2) we obtain the following connection between σ^{FP}_{Born} and σ_{Full} at $\mu = E_T$:

$$\frac{d\sigma^{FP}_{Born}}{dE_T}(E_T, \alpha_s^{FP}(E_T^2)) = \left[\frac{\alpha_s^{FP}(E_T^2)}{\alpha_s(E_T^2)}\right]^2 \frac{d\sigma_{Full}}{dE_T}(E_T, \alpha_s(E_T^2)) \ . \tag{3}$$

Strictly speaking Eq. (3) is an approximation. However, bearing in mind that for μ in the range $0.5 \leq \mu/E_T < 1$ $\sigma_{Full} > \sigma_{Full}(\mu = E_T)$ the *fixed point* enhancement over the conventional QCD cross section will be even bigger than that arising from Eq. (3).

In order to illustrate the magnitude of the deviation of the theoretical FP-QCD predictions from the conventional ones for the one jet production cross section we will use for $\alpha_s^{FP}(\mu^2)$ in Eq. (3) the second order fixed point expression in LO approximation:

$$\alpha_s^{FP}(\mu^2) = \alpha_0 + \frac{\alpha_s(Q_0^2) - \alpha_0}{1 + b\ [\alpha_s(Q_0^2) - \alpha_0]\ ln\ (\mu^2/Q_0^2)} \ . \tag{4}$$

In (4) the parameters α_0 (the fixed point) and b are taken from Ref. [5] to be:

$$\alpha_0 = 0.040 \; , \qquad b = 1 \; . \tag{5}$$

The percentage difference between the theoretical FP-QCD cross sections σ^{FP} at $\mu = E_T$ (Eq. (3) above) and the conventional QCD predictions up to $O(\alpha_s^3)$ using the MRSD0´ parton densities [11] with scale $\mu = E_T/2$ is shown in Fig. 3 and compared with the percentage difference between the CDF inclusive jet cross section data and the above mentioned conventional QCD predictions.

It is seen that in the E_T range $15 - 200 \; GeV$ the FP-QCD predictions practically coincide with those of the conventional version and are in good agreement with the data. However, for E_T above $200 \; GeV$ the *fixed point* cross sections are higher than conventional QCD ones by up to 20% at $E_T = 415 \; GeV$ and are rather closer to the experimental points than the NLO QCD predictions.

In conclusion we suggest that the significant discrepancy between conventional QCD and the CDF inclusive jet production data might be an indication that the QCD β function corresponds to a fixed point behaviour. If correct this fixed point behaviour will manifest itself clearly experimentally in that *all* large E_T cross sections will grow relative to the conventional QCD predictions once $E_T \geq 200 \; GeV$. We hope to provide detailed calculations in the near future.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Drs. D. Soper, M.G. Albrow, A. Bhatti and A. Efremov for helpful information and discussions. One of us (E.L) would like to acknowledge the hospitality of the Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences where this work was carried out.

This research was partly supported by the UK Royal Society, the UK PPARC and by the Bulgarian Science Foundation under Contract Ph 510.

References

[1] F. Abe et al., *Inclusive Jet Cross Section in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV* , Fermilab preprint PUB-96/020-E, 1996.

[2] S. Ellis, Z. Kunszt and D. Soper, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62** (1989) 726, **64** (1990) 2121.

[3] E. Eichten, K. Lane and M. Peskin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50** (1983) 811.

[4] H.D. Politzer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **30** (1973) 1346; D. Gross and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **30** (1973) 1343.

[5] A. V. Sidorov and D. B. Stamenov, *Phys. Lett.* **B357** (1995) 423; JINR preprint E2-96-156, hep-ph/9606224 (1996).

[6] CCFR Collab., S. R. Mishra et al., Nevis Preprint N 1459 (1992); CCFR Collab., W. C. Leung et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B317** (1993) 655; CCFR Collab., P. Z. Quintas et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71** (1993) 1307.

[7] G. Altarelli, Talk at the Four Seas Conference, Trieste, Italy, June, 1955.

[8] A. J. Buras, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **52** (1980) 199.

[9] A. Patrascioiu and E. Seiler, *Expected Deviations from Perturbative QCD at 1 TeV or Less*, preprint MPI-Ph/92-18; *Scaling, Asymptotic Scaling and Improved Perturbation Theory,* preprint MPI-Ph/93-34; J. Finberg, U. Heller and F. Karsh, *Nucl. Phys.* **B392** (1993) 493, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74** (1995) 1924.

[10] D. Soper, private communication.

[11] A.D. Martin, R.G. Roberts and W.J. Stirling, *Phys. Lett.* **B306** (1993) 145.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9609494v2

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9609494v2

This figure "fig1-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9609494v2